

App. No.: 09/681430  
Filed: April 3, 2001

Page 5 of 6

### REMARKS

The courtesies granted applicant's attorney by Examiners Pham and Le during the aforementioned interview are gratefully acknowledged. In spite of the Examiner's indication that entry might require a new search and applicant's attorney's belief that the independent claims are patentable over the cited art, this amendment is being submitted in an effort to reach a compromise. If, however, the entry of this amendment is refused on the alleged basis that it raises new issues, applicant will proceed with an appeal on the finally rejected claims and withdraw this amendment.

Since the Examiner has agreed that amended claim 1 overcomes the final rejection, its patentability will not be further argued. However it is submitted that the added language does not require a new search since the added subject matter is that which the Examiner could and should have expected to be claimed.

Furthermore, the Examiner's alleged finding of the claimed cavity by the first end closure in the Final Rejection was different than that alleged in the first office action and thus caused a change in position that prompted the proposal embodied above. In the first office action the Examiner claimed that this cavity was formed "between 41 and 42". In the Final Rejection, on the other hand, the Examiner first stated that this cavity was formed by "the integral 76 and 29". 29 is in fact the end wall which the Examiner is using as "the first end closure". However 76 is not integral with it but is a separate element which comprises a ring gear that is fixed to the element 29 and thus is not a part of the end wall. Hence a separate part not the end wall forms the cavity in the reference.

The claims that depend on claim 1 recite many additional features that further distinguish even over this already strained interpretation of the claim language which the Examiner is attempting to find in Nakanosono. However in view of the important difference noted above it is not believed necessary here to argue these added patentable distinctions.

Because of the time constraints of the interview it was not possible to discuss independent claim 27. That claim is directed to another feature that patentably distinguishes over Nakanosono. This is the provision of "a cylindrical post" carried by the second end closure that extends into a "cylindrical opening" of the rotor to journal the rotor within the outer housing. The Examiner alleges the post to be the stub axles 15 and

App. No.: 09/681430  
Filed: April 3, 2001

Page 6 of 6

16 of the reference. The rotor 43 of the reference has no openings into which either stub axle extends. In fact the rotor 43 is journaled in a conventional manner by bearings 44 and 45 that are carried by the respective end closures in a conventional manner. The stub axles 15 and 16 actually support the respective, fixed end closures. Thus this reference presents the exact prior art problem solved by this facet of applicant's invention. This feature is also stressed in claims 17-25 that depend directly or indirectly on claim 1.

Thus it is believed that the Final rejections should be withdrawn regardless of whether or not this amendment is entered.

Respectfully submitted:



Ernest A. Beutler  
Reg. No. 19901

FAX RECEIVED

MAR 21 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800